

REMARKS

Claims 11-16 are pending. Claims 11, 12, and 15 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 was objected to for having a minor grammatical error. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that “a electric signal multiplexer” should be “an electric signal multiplexer”. Applicant has amended claim 12 to correct this grammatical error. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

A. Claims 11, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Ishikawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,753). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 11 recites, in part, an optical transmission system which includes a main unit which inputs a first electric signal and outputs a plurality of first optical signals, an inputs a second optical signal and outputs a second electric signal. The main unit comprises an opto-electric converter which converts the second optical signal to a second electric signal; and an electric signal output terminal which outputs the second electric signal. In contrast, Ishikawa discloses (column 3, lines 50-65) a central station 100 which includes an optical sender receiver (OSR) 24 for sending and receiving an optical signals. Ishikawa does not disclose converting an optical signal to an electric signal and therefore does not disclose an output terminal which outputs the second electric signal. Accordingly, Ishikawa does not teach a main unit which includes an opto-electric converter which converts the second optical signal to a second electric signal; and an electric signal output terminal which outputs the second electric signal, as recited in claim 11.

Claims 13 and 14 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

B. Claims 11, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Fussganger (U.S. patent No. 5,202,780). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 11 recites, in part, an optical transmission system which includes a main unit with a plurality of input/output ports, each of which outputs one of said plurality of first optical signals divided by the first optical coupler to one of the sub units through one of the optical fibers and inputs the second optical signal from one of the sub units through one of the optical fibers. In contrast, Fussganger discloses (Figure 1) a multiplexer-demultiplexer 25 with 16 ports. Half of the ports are input ports and the other half are output ports. Therefore, Fussganger does not teach a plurality of input/output ports, each of which outputs a signal to a sub unit and inputs a signal from a sub unit. Accordingly, Fussganger does not teach a plurality of input/output ports, each of which outputs one of said plurality of first optical signals divided by the first optical coupler to one of the sub units through one of the optical fibers and inputs the second optical signal from one of the sub units through one of the optical fibers, as recited in claim 11.

Claims 13 and 14 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ishikawa. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 15 and 16 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

B. Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fussganger. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 15 and 16 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion


Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 12 contains allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of any base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 12 in to independent form.

In view of the foregoing, all the claims are believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP

By:  *Reg No. 51, 813*
for Glenn J. Perry
Reg. No.: 28,458
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2161
Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

GJP\VVK
1600 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102

(703) 905-2000